

Exhibit SN-1

RESUME OF DON SCOTT NORWOOD

Norwood Energy Consulting, L.L.C.

P. O. Box 30197
Austin, Texas 78755-3197
scott@scottnorwood.com
(512) 297-1889

SUMMARY

Scott Norwood is an energy consultant with over 35 years of utility industry experience in the areas of regulatory consulting, resource planning and energy procurement. His clients include government agencies, publicly-owned utilities, public service commissions, municipalities and various electric consumer interests. Over the last 15 years Mr. Norwood has presented expert testimony on electric utility ratemaking, resource planning, and electric utility restructuring issues in over 200 regulatory proceedings in Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin.

Prior to founding Norwood Energy Consulting in January of 2004, Mr. Norwood was employed for 18 years by GDS Associates, Inc., a Marietta, Georgia based energy consulting firm. Mr. Norwood was a Principal of GDS and directed the firm's Deregulated Services Department which provided a range of consulting services including merchant plant due diligence studies, deregulated market price forecasts, power supply planning and procurement projects, electric restructuring policy analyses, and studies of power plant dispatch and production costs.

Before joining GDS, Mr. Norwood was employed by the Public Utility Commission of Texas as Manager of Power Plant Engineering from 1984 through 1986. He began his career in 1980 as Staff Electrical Engineer with the City of Austin's Electric Utility Department where he was in charge of electrical maintenance and design projects at three gas-fired power plants.

Mr. Norwood is a graduate of the college of electrical engineering of the University of Texas.

EXPERIENCE

The following summaries are representative of the range of projects conducted by Mr. Norwood over his 30-year consulting career.

Regulatory Consulting

Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers - Assisted client with technical and economic analysis of proposed EPA regulations and compliance plans involving control of air emissions and potential conversion of coal-to-gas conversion options.

Cities Served by Southwestern Electric Power Company – Analyzed and presented testimony regarding the prudence of a \$1.7 billion coal-fired power plant and related settlement agreements with Sierra Club.

New York Public Service Commission - Conducted inter-company statistical benchmarking analysis of Consolidated Edison Company to provide the New York Public Service Commission with guidance in determining areas that should be reviewed in detailed management audit of the company.

Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers - Analyzed and presented testimony on affiliate energy trading transactions by AEP in ERCOT.

Virginia Attorney General – Analyzed and presented testimony regarding distribution tap line undergrounding program proposed by Dominion Virginia Power Company.

Cities Served by Southwestern Electric Power Company – Analyzed and presented testimony regarding the prudence of the utility’s decision to retire the Welsh Unit 2 coal-fired generating unit in conjunction with a litigation settlement agreement with Sierra Club.

Georgia Public Service Commission - Presented testimony before the Georgia Public Service Commission in Docket 3840-U, providing recommendations on nuclear O&M levels for Hatch and Vogtle and recommending that a nuclear performance standard be implemented in the State of Georgia.

Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers - Analyzed and presented testimony addressing power production and coal plant dispatch issues in fuel prudence cases involving Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company.

Georgia Public Service Commission - Analyzed and provided recommendations regarding the reasonableness of nuclear O&M costs, fossil O&M costs and coal inventory levels reported in GPC's 1990 Surveillance Filing.

City of Houston - Analyzed and presented comments on various legislative proposals impacting retail electric and gas utility operations and rates in Texas.

New York Public Service Commission - Conducted inter-company statistical benchmarking analysis of Rochester Gas & Electric Company to provide the New York Public Service Commission with guidance in determining areas which should be reviewed in detailed management audit of the company.

Virginia Attorney General – Analyzed and presented testimony regarding an accelerated vegetation management program and rider proposed by Appalachian Power Company.

Oklahoma Attorney General – Analyzed and presented testimony regarding fuel and purchased power, depreciation and other expense items in Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company’s 2001 rate case before the Oklahoma Corporation Commission.

City of Houston - Analyzed and presented testimony regarding fossil plant O&M expense levels in Houston Lighting & Power Company's rate case before the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

City of El Paso - Analyzed and presented testimony regarding regulatory and technical issues related to the Central & Southwest/El Paso Electric Company merger and rate proceedings before the PUCT, including analysis of merger synergy studies, fossil O&M and purchased power margins.

Residential Ratepayer Consortium - Analyzed Fermi 2 replacement power and operating performance issues in fuel reconciliation proceedings for Detroit Edison Company before the Michigan Public Service Commission.

Residential Ratepayer Consortium - Analyzed and prepared testimony addressing coal plant outage rate projections in the Consumer's Power Company fuel proceeding before the Michigan Public Service Commission.

City of El Paso - Analyzed and developed testimony regarding Palo Verde operations and maintenance expenses in El Paso Electric Company's 1991 rate case before the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

City of Houston - Analyzed and developed testimony regarding the operations and maintenance expenses and performance standards for the South Texas Nuclear Project, and operations and maintenance expenses for the Limestone and Parish coal-fired power plants in HL&P's 1991 rate case before the PUCT.

City of El Paso - Analyzed and developed testimony regarding Palo Verde operations and maintenance expenses in El Paso Electric Company's 1990 rate case before the Public Utility Commission of Texas. Recommendations were adopted.

Energy Planning and Procurement Services

Virginia Attorney General – Review and provide comments or testimony regarding annual integrated resource plan filings made by Dominion Virginia Power and Appalachian Power Company.

Dell Computer Corporation – Negotiated retail power supply agreement for Dell's Round Rock, Texas facilities producing annual savings in excess of \$2 million.

Texas Association of School Boards Electric Aggregation Program – Serve as TASB's consultant in the development, marketing and administration of a retail electric aggregation program consisting of 2,500 Texas schools with a total load of over 300 MW. Program produced annual savings of more than \$30 million in its first year.

Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers - Analyzed and drafted comments addressing integrated resource plan filings by Public Service Company of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company.

S.C. Johnson - Analyzed and presented testimony addressing Wisconsin Electric Power Company's \$4.1 billion CPCN application to construct three coal-fired generating units in southeast Wisconsin.

Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers - Analyzed wind energy project ownership proposals by Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company and presented testimony addressing project economics and operational impacts.

City of Chicago, Illinois Attorney General, Illinois Citizens' Utility Board - Analyzed Commonwealth Edison's proposed divestiture of the Kincaid and State Line power plants to SEI and Dominion Resources.

Georgia Public Service Commission - Analyzed and presented testimony on Georgia Power Company's integrated resource plan in a certification proceeding for an eight unit, 640 MW combustion turbine facility.

South Dakota Public Service Commission - Evaluated integrated resource plan and power plant certification filing of Black Hills Power & Light Company.

Shell Leasing Co. - Evaluated market value of 540 MW western coal-fired power plant.

Community Energy Electric Aggregation Program – Served as Community Energy's consultant in the development, marketing and start-up of a retail electric aggregation program consisting of major charitable organizations and their donors in Texas.

Austin Energy – Conducted competitive solicitation for peaking capacity. Developed request for proposal, administered solicitation and evaluated bids.

Austin Energy - Provided technical assistance in the evaluation of the economic viability of the City of Austin's ownership interest in the South Texas Project.

Austin Energy - Assisted with regional production cost modeling analysis to assess production cost savings associated with various public power merger and power pool alternatives.

Sam Rayburn G&T Electric Cooperative - Conducted competitive solicitation for peaking capacity. Developed request for proposal, administered solicitation and evaluated bids.

Rio Grande Electric Cooperative, Inc. - Directed preparation of power supply solicitation and conducted economic and technical analysis of offers.

Virginia Attorney General – Review and provide comments or testimony regarding annual demand-side management program programs and rider proposals made by Dominion Virginia Power and Appalachian Power Company.

Austin Energy – Conducted modeling to assess potential costs and benefits of a municipal power pool in Texas.

Electric Restructuring Analyses

Electric Power Research Institute - Evaluated regional resource planning and power market dispatch impacts on rail transportation and coal supply procurement strategies and costs.

Arkansas House of Representatives – Critiqued proposed electric restructuring legislation and identified suggested amendments to provide increased protections for small consumers.

Virginia Legislative Committee on Electric Utility Restructuring – Presented report on status of stranded cost recovery for Virginia’s electric utilities.

Georgia Public Service Commission – Developed models and a modeling process for preparing initial estimates of stranded costs for major electric utilities serving the state of Georgia.

City of Houston – Evaluated and recommended adjustments to Reliant Energy’s stranded cost proposal before the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

Oklahoma Attorney General – Evaluated and advised the Attorney General on technical, economic and regulatory policy issues arising from various electric restructuring proposals considered by the Oklahoma Electric Restructuring Advisory Committee.

State of Hawaii Department of Business, Economics and Tourism – Evaluated electric restructuring proposals and developed models to assess the potential savings from deregulation of the Oahu power market.

Virginia Attorney General - Served as the Attorney General’s consultant and expert witness in the evaluation of electric restructuring legislation, restructuring rulemakings and utility proposals addressing retail pilot programs, stranded costs, rate unbundling, functional separation plans, and competitive metering.

Western Public Power Producers, Inc. - Evaluated operational, cost and regional competitive impacts of the proposed merger of Southwestern Public Service Company and Public Service Company of Colorado.

Iowa Department of Justice, Consumer Advocate Division - Analyzed stranded investment and fuel recover issues resulting from a market-based pricing proposal submitted by MidAmerican Energy Company.

Cullen Weston Pines & Bach/Citizens’ Utility Board - Evaluated estimated costs and benefits of the proposed merger of Wisconsin Energy Corporation and Northern States Power Company (Primergy).

City of El Paso - Evaluated merger synergies and plant valuation issues related to the proposed acquisition and merger of El Paso Electric Company and Central & Southwest Company.

Rio Grande Electric Cooperative, Inc. - Analyzed stranded generation investment issues for Central Power & Light Company.

Power Plant Management

City of Austin Electric Utility Department - Analyzed the 1994 Operating Budget for the South Texas Nuclear Project (STNP) and assisted in the development of long-term performance and expense projections and divestiture strategies for Austin's ownership interest in the STNP.

City of Austin Electric Utility Department - Analyzed and provided recommendations regarding the 1991 capital and O&M budgets for the South Texas Nuclear Project.

Sam Rayburn G&T Electric Cooperative - Developed and conducted operational monitoring program relative to minority owner's interest in Nelson 6 Coal Station operated by Gulf States Utilities.

KAMO Electric Cooperative, City of Brownsville and Oklahoma Municipal Power Agency - Directed an operational audit of the Oklaunion coal-fired power plant.

Sam Rayburn G&T Electric Cooperative - Conducted a management/technical assessment of the Big Cajun II coal-fired power plant in conjunction with ownership feasibility studies for the project.

Kamo Electric Power Cooperative - Developed and conducted operational monitoring program for client's minority interest in GRDA Unit 2 Coal Fired Station.

Northeast Texas Electric Cooperative - Developed and conducted operational monitoring program concerning NTEC's interest in Pirkey Coal Station operated by Southwestern Electric Power Company and Dolet Hills Station operated by Central Louisiana Electric Company.

Corn Belt Electric Cooperative/Central Iowa Power Cooperative - Perform operational monitoring and budget analysis on behalf of co-owners of the Duane Arnold Energy Center.

PRESENTATIONS

Quantifying Impacts of Electric Restructuring: Dynamic Analysis of Power Markets, 1997 NARUC Winter Meetings, Committee on Finance and Technology.

Quantifying Costs and Benefits of Electric Utility Deregulation: Dynamic Analysis of Regional Power Markets, International Association for Energy Economics, 1996 Annual North American Conference.

Railroad Rates and Utility Dispatch Case Studies, 1996 EPRI Fuel Supply Seminar.

Exhibit SN-2

Supplemental Page

Fuel Cost Adjustment Factors

Public Service Company of Oklahoma

Fuel Cost Adjustment Factors (\$/kWh)

Period	Service Level 1	Service Level 2	Service Level 3	Service Level 4/5	Service Level 6
Dec 02 Feb 03	0.003728	0.005433	0.006697	0.007836	
Mar 03 May 03	0.011235	0.012404	0.012909	0.015861	
June 03 Aug 03	0.015371	0.015542	0.015957	0.017454	
Sep 03 Nov 03	0.007748	0.009556	0.010113	0.011269	
Dec 03 Feb 04	0.007748	0.009556	0.010113	0.011269	
Mar 04 – May 04	0.010422	0.010662	0.011315	0.012561	
June 04 – Aug 04	0.014366	0.014653	0.015479	0.017091	
Sept 04 – Nov 04	0.014841	0.014739	0.015677	0.017511	
Dec 04 – Jan 05	0.017581	0.018371	0.019341	0.020977	
Feb 05	0.017782	0.018097	0.018935	0.020527	
Mar 05 – May 05	0.012679	0.013641	0.014764	0.014983	0.016727
June 05 – Nov 05	0.004477	0.003947	0.004884	0.006360	0.006594
Dec 05 – Mar 06	0.024047	0.024642	0.025729	0.028643	0.028877
Apr 06 – May 06	0.012135	0.012521	0.014018	0.016218	0.016452
June 06 – May 07	0.006712	0.006546	0.008031	0.010065	0.010299
June 07 – Apr 08	0.005419	0.007192	0.008444	0.010070	0.010304
May 08	0.005419	0.007192	0.008444	0.010070	0.010070
June 08 – Nov 08	0.024398	0.025158	0.026714	0.027786	0.027786
Dec 08 – Jan 09	0.005398	0.005809	0.007176	0.008363	0.008363
Feb 09	0.003424	0.003893	0.005284	0.006218	0.006218
Mar 09 Apr 09	(0.009739)	(0.009103)	(0.007881)	(0.007653)	(0.007653)
May 09	(0.012574)	(0.012004)	(0.010704)	(0.010599)	(0.010599)
June 09 Dec 09	(0.014161)	(0.014248)	(0.012931)	(0.012792)	(0.012792)
Jan 10 Mar 10	(0.021086)	(0.021915)	(0.020036)	(0.016130)	(0.016130)
Apr 10 May 10	(0.001013)	(0.000737)	0.000263	0.001606	0.001606
June 10 May 11	(0.003972)	(0.003920)	(0.002308)	(0.000651)	(0.000651)
June 11 May 12	(0.003419)	(0.003464)	(0.001316)	0.001888	0.001888
June 12 Feb 13	(0.022249)	(0.022194)	(0.020504)	(0.017696)	(0.017696)
Mar 13 Oct 13	(0.008476)	(0.008764)	(0.007217)	(0.004760)	(0.004760)
Nov 13 April 14	(0.012313)	(0.012187)	(0.010884)	(0.008525)	(0.008525)
May 14 Oct 14	(0.007323)	(0.007117)	(0.005682)	(0.003144)	(0.003144)
Nov 14 April 15	(0.009975)	(0.009970)	(0.008574)	(0.006169)	(0.006169)
May 15 Jan 14, 2016	0.029132	0.028993	0.031750	0.035597	0.035597
Jan 15, 2016 Oct 16	0.020560	0.019326	0.020540	0.027577	0.027577
Nov 2016 April 2017	0.026295	0.025206	0.027994	0.035732	0.035732
May 2017 April 2018	0.028278	0.028475	0.032592	0.040935	0.040935

Exhibit SN-3

BEFORE THE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF OKLAHOMA

APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)
OF OKLAHOMA, AN OKLAHOMA)
CORPORATION, FOR AN ADJUSTMENT IN ITS)
RATES AND CHARGES AND THE ELECTRIC) CAUSE NO. PUD 201700151
SERVICE RULES, REGULATIONS AND)
CONDITIONS OF SERVICE FOR ELECTRIC)
SERVICE IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA)

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE TO
OKLAHOMA INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' ELEVENTH DATA REQUESTS

Question No. 7:

Electronic files are acceptable.

Please advise whether AEP's operating companies in Texas and Arkansas have made interim adjustments of their fuel cost adjustment factor

Response No. 7:

Interim adjustments are not applicable in Texas. However, SWEPCO has implemented surcharge or refund factors as needed to address over/under recoveries. Interim adjustments have been made in Arkansas.

Prepared By: Randall W. Hamlett

Title: Dir Regulatory Acctg Svcs

Date Response Provided: 8/25/2017

BEFORE THE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF OKLAHOMA

APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)
OF OKLAHOMA, AN OKLAHOMA)
CORPORATION, FOR AN ADJUSTMENT IN ITS)
RATES AND CHARGES AND THE ELECTRIC) CAUSE NO. PUD 201700151
SERVICE RULES, REGULATIONS AND)
CONDITIONS OF SERVICE FOR ELECTRIC)
SERVICE IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA)

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE TO
OKLAHOMA INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' ELEVENTH DATA REQUESTS

Question No. 8:

Electronic files are acceptable.

If the answer to questions 7 above is yes, please provide the number of instances in which AEP operating companies have in Texas and Arkansas made interim adjustments to their fuel factors and the reasons for such adjustments.

Response No. 8:

Within the last 5 years, there has been one surcharge/refund in Texas and one interim adjustment in Arkansas.

Prepared By: Randall W. Hamlett

Title: Dir Regulatory Acctg Svcs

Date Response Provided: 8/25/2017

Exhibit SN-4

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF
 OKLAHOMA
 P.O. BOX 201
 TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74102-0201
 PHONE: 1-888-216-0201
 KIND OF SERVICE: ELECTRIC

45TH REVISED SHEET NO. 70-1
 REPLACING 4THRD REVISED SHEET NO. 70-1A
 EFFECTIVE DATE: 12/29~~30~~/2017~~6~~

SCHEDULE: FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT RIDER (FA)

AVAILABILITY

This Rider is applicable to and becomes a part of each OCC jurisdictional rate schedule in which reference is made to Fuel Cost Adjustment (FCA).

ADJUSTMENT

The Fuel Cost Adjustment shall be calculated by multiplying the total billing kilowatt-hours (kWh) by the Service Level Fuel Cost Adjustment Factor for the current billing period. The Service Level Fuel Cost Adjustment Factor shall be determined each year on an annual basis and shall become effective with the October~~November~~ billing cycle in the following manner:

$$FA = \frac{FUELS + DEFS}{S}$$

WHERE:

FA = The Service Level Fuel Cost Adjustment Factor (expressed in dollars per kWh) to be applied per kWh consumed.

DEFS = The service level prior month's balance sheet amount for ~~the over-recovered fuel cost~~ Unrecovered Fuel Cost divided by the service level ~~monthly~~annual retail kWh sales, or the prior month's balance sheet amount for under-recovered fuel cost divided by the service level annual retail kWh sales.

S = Retail service level kWh sales for the period adjusted for any directly assigned fuel kWh,

FUELS = (SYSS + PPES - OSEC) x ((S x SLEF)/U) + (GTDS+PPDS-RECS) x SLPDA)

Rates Authorized by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Effective	Order Number	Cause/Docket Number
December 30, 2016	657877/658529	PUD 201500208
April 30, 2015	639314	PUD 201300217

January 31, 2011 581748 PUD 201000050
 January 29, 2009 564437 PUD 200800144

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF
 OKLAHOMA
 P.O. BOX 201
 TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74102-0201
 PHONE: 1-888-216-0201
 KIND OF SERVICE: ELECTRIC

REPLACING ~~3RD~~ 4TH REVISED SHEET NO. 70-2
 EFFECTIVE DATE: 12/29~~30~~/2017~~6~~

SCHEDULE: FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT RIDER (FA)

WHERE:

- SYSS = The OCC allowable fuel expense for the period shall be the fuel expense set forth in the FERC Account 5010 and FERC Account 5470 along with the appropriate subaccounts for FERC Accounts 502, 509 and 348 for which consumables are charged. This value will be adjusted for any directly assigned fuel expense associated with off-system sales.

- PPES = The energy cost of purchased power for the period shall be the purchased power expense set forth in FERC Account 5550. The purchased power cost shall also include the cost of power purchased from customers, cogeneration and small power production facilities as recorded in FERC Account 5550. This value will be adjusted for any purchased power costs reflected in the OSEC.

- PPDS = The capacity cost of purchased power for the period shall be the purchased power expense set forth in FERC Account 3550. The purchased power cost shall also include the cost of power purchased from customer, cogeneration and small power production facilities as recorded in FERC Account 5550. This value will be adjusted for any purchased power costs reflected in the OSEC.

- RECS = Proceeds from the sales of Renewable Energy Credits.

- OSEC = 90% Of the margin from off-system sales of electricity other than sales in the SPP market and 75% of the margins from standby service.

Rates Authorized by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Effective	Order Number	Cause/Docket Number
December 30, 2016	657877/658529	PUD 201500208
April 30, 2015	639314	PUD 201300217

January 31, 2011	581748	PUD 201000050
January 29, 2009	564437	PUD 200800144

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF
OKLAHOMA
P.O. BOX 201
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74102-0201
PHONE: 1-888-216-0201
KIND OF SERVICE: ELECTRIC

54 TH REVISED SHEET NO.	70-3
REPLACING 3 RD 4 TH REVISED SHEET NO.	70-3A
EFFECTIVE DATE:	12/29 30 /2017 6

SCHEDULE: FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT RIDER (FA)

- S = Retail service level kWh sales for the period adjusted for any directly assigned fuel kWh.
- U = Total system service level kWh sales at the generator by the Company for the period adjusted for any directly assigned fuel kWh. The OCC jurisdictional amount is defined as OCC jurisdictional kWh sales divided by total company sales exclusive of off-system sales (net system sales).
- SLEF = The service level expansion factor from the most recent line loss study.
- SLPDA = The service level production demand allocator from the current test year cost of service study.
- GTDS = The gas transportation and agency expense incurred for the period and is set out in FERC Account 5010.

ANNUAL APPLICATIONS TO REVISE FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT FACTOR

Annual revisions to the FCA factor are subject to review and approval by the OCC. An application to revise the FCA shall be filed with the OCC each year, 60 days prior to the first billing cycle in October when the proposed rates are expected to be placed in effect. The filing shall be made concurrent with a filing to address annual changes to PSO's Southwest Power Pool Transmission Cost (SPPTC) Tariff. Proposed revisions to the FCA shall be supported by the application filing package that includes testimony and schedules that present the FCA calculation, the underlying forecast of costs supporting the FCA, a discussion of the primary factors that are causing the need for the FCA revision, and estimated impacts of the proposed FCA revision on customers for each rate class. A complete copy of the FCA revision application and filing package shall be served on each party in the Company's most recent base rate proceeding concurrent with the filing. The underlying forecast provided in support of the FCA revisions shall present detail on expenses by energy supply resource and the associated energy sales for each month of the annual period in which the proposed FCA is expected to be in effect. The scope of this proceeding will be limited to the reasonableness of the FCA calculation and the underlying forecast. Issues regarding prudence of the underlying fuel charges and the final

reconciliation of fuel expenses will be reserved for the Company's next annual fuel adjustment clause prudence proceeding. Any party may request a hearing on the proposed FCA revision by filing an objectiona with the OCC within 15 days of the filing of the annual FCA application .

MONTHLY FCA REPORTS

PSO will provide monthly fuel reports documenting fuel expenses and revenues collected through the FA Rider. A complete copy of these monthly FCA Reports will be provided concurrently in an electronic format to the PUD staff and to each party in the Company's most recent base rate or FCA revision proceeding.

SUCCESSOR ACCOUNTS AND SUBACCOUNTS

Successor accounts and subaccounts may be included as appropriate following advance notification to the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Director of Public Utilities.

INTERIM ADJUSTMENT OF FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT FACTOR

In the event that the annual cost of fuel begins to differ significantly from the cost used in the annual fuel cost adjustment factor or the over/under-recovered balance is \$50,000,000 or more, an interim adjustment may be filed. The Director of the Public Utility Division shall approve the requested change effective with the first billing cycle of the month subsequent to the approval.

Rates Authorized by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Effective	Order Number	Cause/Docket Number
December 30, 2016	657877/658529	PUD 201500208
April 30, 2015	639314	PUD 201300217
January 31, 2011	581748	PUD 201000050
January 29, 2009	564437	PUD 200800144

[3127611.1:620435:00725](#)

Exhibit SN-5

BEFORE THE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF OKLAHOMA

APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)
OF OKLAHOMA, AN OKLAHOMA)
CORPORATION, FOR AN ADJUSTMENT IN ITS)
RATES AND CHARGES AND THE ELECTRIC) CAUSE NO. PUD 201700151
SERVICE RULES, REGULATIONS AND)
CONDITIONS OF SERVICE FOR ELECTRIC)
SERVICE IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA)

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE TO OKLAHOMA
INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' FOURTEENTH DATA REQUESTS

Question No. 9:

Provide the portion of PSO's total annual expenses reported in FERC account 565 that are based on projected costs of other transmission owners in SPP for each month since January 2015 through the most recent date for which information is available.

Response No. 9:

While projected costs may be a component of a SPP transmission owner's revenue requirement in their respective FERC approved rate under the SPP tariff, there is no distinction made on the SPP billing statements. The annual expenses reported in FERC account 565 are PSO's actual expenses and not projected expenses.

Prepared By: Randall W. Hamlett

Title: Dir Regulatory Acctg Svcs

Date Response Provided: 9/6/2017

BEFORE THE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF OKLAHOMA

**APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)
OF OKLAHOMA, AN OKLAHOMA)
CORPORATION, FOR AN ADJUSTMENT IN ITS)
RATES AND CHARGES AND THE ELECTRIC) CAUSE NO. PUD 201700151
SERVICE RULES, REGULATIONS AND)
CONDITIONS OF SERVICE FOR ELECTRIC)
SERVICE IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA)**

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE TO OKLAHOMA
INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' FOURTEENTH DATA REQUESTS**

Question No. 10:

Describe actions taken by PSO to verify the reasonableness of projected transmission O&M and capital costs included in amounts billed to PSO by SPP.

Response No. 10:

PSO is billed by SPP for its use of the transmission system in the SPP RTO footprint. The charges billed by SPP to its members, including PSO, are pursuant to FERC-approved rates and are in the SPP OATT. PSO fully participates in the SPP stakeholder processes and has representation on several SPP Committees, Working Groups and Task Forces that have been formed in order to ensure that transmission upgrades are necessary and their costs reasonable. For example, PSO is represented on the Transmission Working Group, which is responsible for evaluating transmission additions, and on the Project Cost Working Group, which monitors the costs associated with SPP-approved transmission upgrades. PSO's participation in these SPP processes are described in more detail in the direct testimony of C. Richard Ross on pages 5-10. On pages 18-20 in the direct testimony of Mr. Ross, he also provides an overview of the "reasonable costs and benefits to PSO customers" of transmission project costs under the SPP OATT.

Prepared By: Wayman L. Smith

Title: Dir Trans Planning

Date Response Provided: 9/6/2017

Exhibit SN-6

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKLAHOMA
P.O. BOX 201
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74102-0201
PHONE: 1-888-216-3523

4TH REVISED SHEET NO. 75-1
REPLACING 3RD REVISED SHEET NO. 75-1
EFFECTIVE DATE 12/29/2017

SCHEDULE: SOUTHWEST POWER POOL TRANSMISSION COST (SPPTC) TARIFF

AVAILABILITY

This Tariff is applicable to and becomes part of each OCC jurisdictional rate schedule and will apply to applicable energy consumption or maximum billing demand of retail customers served at all service levels and to facilities, premises and loads of retail customer.

This Tariff will include projected Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Base Plan expenses (Schedule 11 of the SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff), including any credits or refunds. Base plan costs are associated with projects constructed by non-PSO transmission owners within the SPP, excluding costs of projects constructed by Oklahoma Transmission Company, Inc. (OK Transco).

The SPPTC shall be calculated on the customer's bill by multiplying the total billing kilowatt-hours (kWh) for each customer in the residential and commercial major rate class and by maximum billing demand for the industrial major rate classes by the SPPTC Factor for that customer's class for the current month. For service billed under applicable rate schedules for which there is not metering, the monthly usage shall be estimated by the Company and the SPPTC Factor shall be applied to the estimated usage.

The SPPTC Factors shall be determined on an annual basis for each major rate class. The factors shall include the upcoming period's projected SPP Base Plan expenses plus an over or under recovery of actual expenses compared to revenues received under the Tariff for the prior period.

Method of Calculation for SPPTC Factor:

An SPPTC Factor is calculated annually for each major rate class using the applicable billing determinant, either per kWh or per maximum demand depending on the major rate class. The formula for the SPPTC Factor is as follows:

$$\text{SPPTC Factor} = \frac{(\text{SPP Expenses} * \text{Class Transmission Allocator}) + \text{True-up}}{\text{Applicable Billing Determinant by Major Rate Class}}$$

where,

SPP Expenses = Projected Schedule 11 Base Plan Expense of the SPP Open Access Tariff associated with projects constructed by non-PSO or AEP affiliated transmission owners within SPP, excluding costs of projects constructed by AEP affiliates other than SWEPCO or, if

Rates Authorized by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Effective	Order Number	Cause / Docket Number
<u>December 29, 2017</u>		<u>PUD 201700151</u>
December 30, 2016	657877/658529	PUD 201500208
April 30, 2015	639314	PUD 201300217
December 30, 2011	591185	PUD 201100106

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKLAHOMA
P.O. BOX 201
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74102-0201
PHONE: 1-888-216-3523

4TH REVISED SHEET NO. 75 - 2
REPLACING 3RD REVISED SHEET NO. 75 - 2
EFFECTIVE DATE 12/29/2017

SCHEDULE: SOUTHWEST POWER POOL TRANSMISSION COST (SPPTC) TARIFF

applicable, Southwest Transmission Company, including any credits and refunds allocated to the Oklahoma retail jurisdiction using the most recent jurisdictional transmission allocators.

Class Transmission Allocator = the most recent class transmission allocator for each major rate class within the Oklahoma retail jurisdiction.

True-up = Over or under recovery of the previous period's actual SPP Expenses compared to SPPTC revenues by major rate class.

Billing Determinant by Major Rate Class = Projected applicable billing determinant for each major class, either kWh or maximum demand for the twelve month effective period of the SPPTC Factors.

ANNUAL APPLICATIONS TO REVISE SPPTC TARIFF

Annual revisions to the SPPTC Tariff are subject to review and approval by the OCC. PSO shall file an application with the OCC to revise the SPPTC Rider each year, 60 days prior to the first billing cycle in October, when the proposed rates are expected to be placed in effect. The filing shall also address annual changes to PSO's Fuel Adjustment (FA) Rider. Proposed revisions to the SPPTC shall be supported by an application and filing package that includes testimony and schedules that present the SPPTC calculation, the underlying costs supporting the revision, a discussion of the primary factors that are causing the need for the revision, and estimated impacts of the proposed SPPTC revision on customers for each rate class. A complete electronic copy of the SPPTC revision application and filing package shall be served on each party in the Company's most recent base rate proceeding concurrent with the OCC filing. The scope of this SPPTC revision proceeding will be limited to the reasonableness of the SPPTC calculation. Issues regarding prudence of the underlying SPPTC charges and the final reconciliation of any over- or under-recovery of SPPTC expenses will be reserved for the Company's next annual base rate proceeding. Any party may request a hearing on the proposed SPPTC revision by filing an objection to the proposed SPPTC revision with the OCC within 15 days of the filing of the joint FCA/SPPTC application.

Annual Re-determination:

Beginning in 2015, and continuing each year thereafter, the Company will file re-determined SPPTC factors each year according to these tariff provisions. Calculations for the re-determined rates shall be made by the application of the SPPTC formula set forth in this tariff.

The reasonableness of costs recovered through the SPPTC Tariff will be reviewed and determined in the first PSO base rate proceeding following the period in which SPPTC charges are in effect. In each base rate proceeding, the Company shall file testimony with information sufficient to document and support the reasonableness of the projected SPP Expenses recovered through the SPPTC Tariff including the reasonableness of underlying charges by transmission owners that are reflected in

Rates Authorized by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Effective	Order Number	Cause / Docket Number
<u>December 29, 2017</u>		<u>PUD 201700151</u>
December 30, 2016	657877/658529	PUD 201500208
April 30, 2015	639314	PUD 201300217
December 30, 2011	591185	PUD 201100106

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKLAHOMA
P.O. BOX 201
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74102-0201
PHONE: 1-888-216-3523

4TH REVISED SHEET NO. 75 - 3
REPLACING 3RD REVISED SHEET NO. 75 - 3
EFFECTIVE DATE 12/29/2017

SCHEDULE: SOUTHWEST POWER POOL TRANSMISSION COST (SPPTC) TARIFF

~~SPP charges, the reasonableness of any calculations to address over- or under-recovery of SPPTC charges to each rate class, and justification for continuation of the SPPTC Tariff rather than recovery of such costs through base rates. True-up amounts during the previous period, and the re-determined SPPTC rates with each annual re-determination.~~

~~With the filing, the company shall provide the projected revenue impact of the annual SPP Expense re-determination for each major customer class. The company shall also provide any information or studies regarding the economic benefit or analysis to customers associated with the eligible incremented SPP expenses.~~

~~The company will address the reasonableness of SPP Expenses collected through the SPPTC during the next PSO base rate case and in future base rate cases. Based on the review by the Commission Staff and parties in the next base rate case, any over or under recovery of SPP Expenses collected through the SPPTC shall be refunded to or collected from customers with interest calculated at the applicable Commission established interest rate applied to customer deposits for deposits held one year or less, or the interest rate applied to customer deposits held for more than one year.~~

~~Should a cumulative over-recovery or under-recovery balance arise during any SPPTC cycle which exceeds ten percent (10%) of the annual SPP Expenses reflected in the current SPPTC, then either the Commission Staff or the Company may propose an interim revision to the currently effective SPPTC rate. Should an increase exceed fifty percent (50%) of the last approved increase, the Commission will require a broader review of the SPPTC filing.~~

Rates Authorized by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Effective	Order Number	Cause / Docket Number
December 29, 2017		PUD 201700151
December 30, 2016	657877/658529	PUD 201500208
April 30, 2015	639314	PUD 201300217
December 30, 2011	591185	PUD 201100106